

## University of California, Hastings College of the Law UC Hastings Scholarship Repository

---

Propositions

California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives

---

2002

# BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS. STATE GRANTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca\\_ballot\\_props](http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props)

---

### Recommended Citation

BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS. STATE GRANTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE. California Proposition 49 (2002).  
[http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca\\_ballot\\_props/1207](http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/1207)

This Proposition is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [marcusc@uchastings.edu](mailto:marcusc@uchastings.edu).

**BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS.  
STATE GRANTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.**

## OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

*Prepared by the Attorney General*

**BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS.  
STATE GRANTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.**

- Increases state grant funds available for before/after school programs, providing tutoring, homework assistance, and educational enrichment.
- Makes every public elementary, middle/junior high school, including charter schools, eligible for after school grants ranging from \$50,000–\$75,000. Maintains local funding match requirement.
- Provides priority for additional funding to schools with predominantly low-income students.
- Requires that, beginning 2004–05, new funding for before/after school programs not be taken from education funding, guaranteed under Proposition 98. Gives priority to schools already receiving grants and requires increasing expenditures only if state revenues grow.

**SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST’S ESTIMATE OF NET STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
FISCAL IMPACT:**

- Additional annual state costs for before and after school programs of up to \$455 million, beginning in 2004–05.

## ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

## BACKGROUND

The state currently funds a before and after school program for pupils in public elementary, middle, and junior high schools. The program (officially known as the Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Program) provides competitive grants for schools to offer educational enrichment and either tutoring or homework assistance before and/or after “regular” school hours. The program requires a local match and gives priority to serving pupils from schools with at least 50 percent of pupils eligible for federally subsidized meals. Under existing law, *after* school grants generally do not exceed \$75,000 for elementary schools and \$100,000 for middle and junior high schools for each regular school year, and *before* school grants generally do not exceed \$25,000 for elementary schools and \$33,000 for middle and junior high schools. However, large schools can receive higher grant amounts. Participating schools are also eligible to receive a supplemental grant to operate a program during summer or other vacation periods. The state spent \$95.3 million for the program in 2001–02.

Similar to the state’s program, the federal government also provides academic and recreational activities before and after regular school hours to students at many sites in California. The state will receive \$41.5 million in federal funds in 2002–03 to administer and provide new grants to local education agencies and community-based organizations for these activities.

**Resources Available for Similar Services.** In addition to the above before and after school programs, the state and federal governments provide potential sources of funds for before and after school services.

- The state provides a total of \$475 million annually for supplemental instruction outside the regular classroom (before or after school, summer, or other vacation periods) in order to improve the academic skills of pupils in various subjects.
- Both the state and federal government provide a combined \$215 million annually for numerous programs that can provide before and after school services such as: (1) after school child care, (2) college outreach programs, (3) mentor programs, and (4) crime prevention activities.

Before and after school programs are also offered to students in local communities through many private organizations, religious institutions, and local parks and recreation centers. Many students also participate in extracurricular activities, including school sports, after regular school hours.

## PROPOSAL

This proposition makes various funding changes to the state’s Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Program. The measure also renames the program to the After School Education and Safety Program (funds would still be available for before school programs) and makes other technical programmatic changes.

## Funding Provisions

The measure’s funding changes are summarized below.

**Increased Before and After School Funding.** Under Proposition 98, approved by the voters in 1988, the State Constitution requires appropriation of a minimum annual amount for public schools and community colleges (K–14 education) from the state General Fund and local property tax revenues. Generally, this annual amount is based on prior-year spending adjusted for growth in the number of students attending public schools and growth in the state’s economy.

Beginning in 2004–05, this measure requires a specific spending level each year for the renamed After School Education and Safety Program. The annual amount would be up to \$550 million, and would depend on the growth in General Fund spending outside of Proposition 98. The measure specifies that funding for the program would be “continuously appropriated” (that is, appropriated automatically each year without further legislative action) and that the statutes authorizing the continuous appropriation may not be amended by the Legislature.

**New Funding Priorities Within Before and After School Program.** Beginning in fiscal year 2004–05, the measure establishes new funding priorities. First, schools that received a state before or after school grant in 2003–04 would continue to receive an equivalent grant amount in 2004–05

## ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST (CONT.)

and each subsequent year. The second priority under the measure is to make every elementary, middle, and junior high school eligible to receive a new After School Education and Safety Universal Grant to operate after school programs during the regular school year. However, if available funding were insufficient to provide after school funding to all schools, priority for the new grants would be consistent with current law, targeting schools with at least 50 percent of its pupils eligible for federally subsidized meals. If the first and second priorities are fully funded, any additional funds would be distributed for both before and after school programs based on current priorities and funding rules. The measure allows schools receiving a grant under the first two priorities to apply for these additional funds.

**Funding Rules for New After School Universal Grants.** Under this measure, schools awarded a universal after school grant would be reimbursed up to \$5 per participating pupil per day. This funding rate is the same as the after school component of the current state program. However, the measure caps the new universal grants at lower amounts—\$50,000 for elementary schools and \$75,000 for middle and junior high schools—for each regular school year. In addition, these grant amounts would not be adjusted upward for large schools. As with existing law, schools receiving a grant would need \$1 in local matching funds for each \$2 of universal grant funds.

**Funds for Training, Evaluation, and State Administration.** Beginning in 2004–05, this measure allows the State Department of Education (SDE) to spend up to 1.5 percent of the funds for the After School Education and Safety Program on program evaluations and training, and support for program implementation and development. The department may also use program funds to cover the costs of awarding and monitoring program grants.

### Program Provisions

With regard to programmatic changes, the proposition:

- Provides flexibility to conduct before and after school programs away from school sites, but requires that offsite locations be approved by SDE.
- Adds computer training as an additional subject area for permissible tutoring or homework assistance and adds fine arts and physical fitness activities as types of permissible activities for educational enrichment.

- Requires local law enforcement agencies to be included in the planning process of every program.
- Directs SDE to annually notify all schools of the availability of before and after school grants.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

**Impact on Before and After School Spending.** Based on the measure's funding formula and our projections of future state spending, we estimate that the maximum amount required by the proposition—\$550 million—would be available in 2004–05 for the After School Education and Safety Program. (The Legislature could appropriate additional funds above this amount at its discretion.) This is about \$455 million above the program's funding level in 2001–02. (The actual level of future funding for this program absent this measure would depend on future legislative action.)

**Impact on Overall State Spending.** While the measure would increase spending on before and after school programs, its overall impact on state spending would range from no additional cost to \$455 million beginning in 2004–05. The actual impact would depend on future legislative actions, as follows:

- **Allocate Funds Within Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee.** If the Legislature were to increase funding for the After School Education and Safety Program in 2003–04 (the year prior to the effective date of the measure's funding requirements), the additional funding could come from available funds allocated *within* the Proposition 98 minimum funding guarantee. (Since the guarantee generally grows faster than enrollment growth and increases in cost of living, additional funding could be provided for this program without affecting existing programs.) By providing some or all of the required program expansion in 2003–04, the state could reduce—or even eliminate—additional costs in 2004–05 and each subsequent year. Under this scenario, additional funds would be awarded to schools in 2003–04 based on priorities and funding rules set by the Legislature.
- **Allocate Funds Above Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee.** If, on the other hand, additional funds were provided to the program in 2004–05 (the first year of the measure's funding requirements), these funds would be *on top of* the state's minimum funding requirement for

## ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST (CONT.)

Proposition 98 for that year. In effect, this would cause the state to “over-appropriate” Proposition 98’s minimum requirement. This would result in a permanent increase in the annual level of state appropriations for K–14 education and make less money available for other General Fund supported programs. The additional funds provided to the program in 2004–05—which could be as much as \$455 million—would be awarded to schools

based on the funding priorities established by this proposition. These additional funds would first be used to provide schools with a universal after school grant.

**Administrative Costs.** We estimate that the amount of funds needed from the \$550 million appropriation for SDE to provide technical assistance, evaluation, and state administration would total in the low millions of dollars annually.

## ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 49

Proposition 49 will:

- Make our neighborhoods safe
- Give our children a safe, educational, and recreational place to go after school
- Save taxpayers money
- Help working families

Proposition 49 is funded out of future growth in state revenues, but only after our economy has recovered. IT WILL NOT REQUIRE AN INCREASE IN TAXES OR AFFECT THE CURRENT BUDGET. The prestigious Rose Institute says Proposition 49 saves society approximately \$9 for every \$1 invested. THE RETURN TO TAXPAYERS ALONE IS APPROXIMATELY 3 DOLLARS FOR EVERY 1 TAX DOLLAR INVESTED. That's why it's endorsed by taxpayer watchdog groups such as the California Taxpayers' Association, the National Tax Limitation Committee and the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

Proposition 49 provides over \$400 million in direct grants to elementary and junior high schools. These funds can ONLY be used for after school programs.

Recent studies of existing after school programs by major universities and think tanks such as UCLA, UC Irvine, USC, and the Rand Institute are unanimous—after school programs change lives by improving grades and reducing crime.

POLICE STATISTICS SHOW THAT VIOLENT JUVENILE CRIME—HOMICIDE, RAPE, ROBBERY, AND ASSAULT—INCREASES DRAMATICALLY DURING THE AFTER SCHOOL HOURS BETWEEN 3PM AND 6PM, creating a “danger zone” for our kids and our neighborhoods. 3PM to 6PM is the time when up to 1 million California kids under the age of 15 may be left unsupervised. These are the hours when kids are most likely to join gangs, use alcohol and tobacco, and become addicted to drugs.

A study of the most crime-ridden schools in Los Angeles showed CRIME RATES DROPPED 40% WHEN THOSE SCHOOLS OFFERED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS. In another study, vandalism and stealing plummeted 66%, while violent acts, carrying

concealed weapons, and arrests were reduced 50% among program participants.

PROPOSITION 49 IMPROVES GRADES AND TEST SCORES. Studies show that after school programs increase scores on standardized math and reading tests and improve grades, while decreasing the incidence of grade repetition, dropping out of school, and remedial education.

Proposition 49 was put on the ballot by nearly 800,000 Californians. IT IS SUPPORTED BY THE WIDEST COALITION OF CALIFORNIANS OF ANY BALLOT MEASURE IN RECENT MEMORY.

PROPOSITION 49 IS ENDORSED BY:

LAW ENFORCEMENT: Attorney General Bill Lockyer, California State Sheriffs' Association, California District Attorneys Association, California Narcotic Officers' Association, California Peace Officers' Association, California Police Activities League, Fight Crime: Invest in Kids, and almost 60 individual police chiefs.

EDUCATION: California Teachers Association, California Parent Teachers Association (PTA), California School Employees Association, Children Now, and hundreds of school superintendents and principals.

TAXPAYERS ORGANIZATIONS: California Taxpayers' Association, National Tax Limitation Committee, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

OTHER LEADERSHIP GROUPS: American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), California Chamber of Commerce, California Business Roundtable, California YMCA, California Girl Scouts, Hispanic 100, the Democratic Speaker of the Assembly, the Republican Leader of the Senate, over 70 Mayors and 200 other public officials of both parties, from Members of Congress to City Council members. JOIN US AT WWW.JOINARNOLD.COM.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER

WAYNE JOHNSON, *President*

*California Teachers Association*

WARREN RUPF, *President*

*California State Sheriffs' Association*

## REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 49

The decision to oppose Prop 49 was not easy, because we knew that most organizations with serious concerns about the measure would choose to remain silent.

But the League of Women Voters of California is not intimidated by the popularity and economic strength of a ballot measure's proponent. Our obligation is informing voters of *responsible* approaches to the critical issues facing Californians.

We actively support quality after school programs that change lives by improving academic performance and reducing crime.

*The League believes it is our collective responsibility to promote the well being of children and encourage them to reach their full potential.*

But this requires *more* than just after school programs.

It requires programs that provide child protection, family advocacy, medical care, dental care, mental health care and assistance in meeting such basic human needs...food, clothing and housing.

Maybe you support all these children's programs, but *other* priorities are also important to you—like environmental protection, public health care, senior assistance and trauma centers.

*None* of these important programs has guaranteed funding. But Prop 49 fully funds one after school program, year after year, in good budget times and bad.

Is that fair? Is that good public policy?

We ask you to go beyond the rhetoric. Study the issues. Look at the larger picture. Don't be fooled into thinking Prop 49 can solve all of society's problems.

Don't allow \$550,000,000 of your tax dollars to be isolated from the budget process each year.

Stop Prop 49.

BARBARA INATSUGU, *President*

*League of Women Voters of California*



## ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 49

Proposition 49 is a bad approach to a good cause.

Prop 49 looks good, but in reality it disregards principles of good government by reducing government's flexibility to respond to changing needs and priorities. It takes a specific after school program, which many people will see as worthwhile, and sets it apart from all other needs funded by your tax dollars.

Read carefully. Look beyond rhetoric. See the larger picture.

This program will:

- be entitled to guaranteed funding every year, in good budget times *and bad*.
- get a free pass through the budget process *every year*.
- receive *special protection* not afforded to other priorities like public safety, health care, environmental protection, transportation, social service programs, tax cuts and even other after school programs.

And because this program receives special protection from budget cuts, it means that in times of economic downturn *other programs* may be cut to fund it—even those with potentially greater impact on children.

**INADEQUATE PROVISIONS FOR RISING COSTS AND AN ONGOING BUDGET CRISIS.** The drafters of this initiative say that other programs won't be cut to pay for it, because they have included a provision that would only expand after school spending when spending on other programs has also significantly expanded. Their assumption is that if there is money to expand programs like health care or public safety, there should be money to expand after school programs too.

The problem is that their trigger is too small. Inflation and population growth alone will require twice the amount they've

calculated. In tough budget times like these, that will mean other programs *will* have to be cut, or taxes raised.

**A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT.** Proposition 98, passed by voters in 1988, sets aside a portion of the state budget for K–14 education programs. But the amount spent on *specific* programs is still decided during the budget process, every year. No program, regardless of how worthy, gets a free ride—yet.

Prop 49 is the first attempt to earmark money for one particular program within the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Prop 49 would increase the Proposition 98 guarantee level without raising additional revenues, so that programs funded outside the guarantee would be more vulnerable during economic downturns.

If Prop 49 passes, other special interests will try similar measures in future elections. The result?

- Less flexibility to address future and changing education needs.
- Less money available in the non-Prop 98 part of the budget for other programs that directly impact the lives of our children, such as certain childcare programs, environmental programs, health care and social services.
- Less discretionary money available for local school districts.

Look at the bigger picture. VOTE NO ON PROP 49.

BARBARA INATSUGU, *President*  
*League of Women Voters of California*

## REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 49

The League of Women Voters is nearly alone in their opposition to Proposition 49. And even they say 49 is “a good cause.” Here’s why:

Studies by major universities prove that AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS REDUCE GANG ACTIVITY, REDUCE ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE, IMPROVE GRADES AND TEST SCORES AND MAKE OUR COMMUNITIES SAFER FOR EVERYONE.

AND PROPOSITION 49 WILL SAVE TAXPAYERS MONEY. FOR EVERY \$1 INVESTED, TAXPAYERS SAVE \$3 BY REDUCING THE COSTS OF JUVENILE CRIME, REMEDIAL EDUCATION AND GRADE REPETITION.

The League’s counter arguments are primarily technical budgeting arguments and, according to state budget experts and taxpayer organizations, they are simply mistaken.

SECTION 10D OF PROPOSITION 49 SPECIFICALLY STATES THAT AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS ARE NOT GUARANTEED ANNUAL FUNDING. Funds can be cut in bad budget years in exactly the same way other education programs are cut.

PROPOSITION 49 WILL BE FUNDED ONLY AFTER OUR ECONOMY RECOVERS. STATE REVENUES FOR NON-EDUCATION PROGRAMS MUST GROW BY AT LEAST \$1.5 BILLION BEFORE PROPOSITION 49 GETS

A DIME. Budget experts and taxpayer organizations agree that \$1.5 billion is enough to protect vital programs such as HEALTH CARE, PUBLIC SAFETY and EDUCATION—WITHOUT RAISING TAXES.

Proposition 49 allows intergenerational mentoring through use of seniors and saves money by using existing school facilities.

PROPOSITION 49 HAS BEEN ENDORSED BY MAJOR STATEWIDE ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING: DOCTORS, SENIOR CITIZENS, TAXPAYER ADVOCATES, EDUCATORS, DISTRICT ATTORNEYS, FIREFIGHTERS, LABOR UNIONS, SHERIFFS, POLICE OFFICERS, CRIME VICTIMS, CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE and by PROMINENT REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC ELECTED OFFICIALS, ACADEMIC and COMMUNITY LEADERS.

JON COUPAL, *President*  
*Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association*  
JAN HARP DOMENE, *President*  
*California State Parent Teachers Association*  
TOM PORTER, *California State Director*  
AARP